

**COMMENT LETTER 107 - KATHLEEN AND JUDY KIRKLAND (OCTOBER 1, 1996),
RECEIVED OCTOBER 7, 1996**

Response to Comment 107-1

Comment Summary: The comment requests consideration of an ocean outfall alternative.

Ocean discharge was evaluated during the screening process and was dropped from consideration because it did not achieve the purpose of water reclamation. Refer to Appendix D-6 (Documentation in Support of Elimination of Alternatives), of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment 107-2

Comment Summary: The comment states that there was inadequate access to the Draft EIR/EIS at the county libraries and that the costs for the document were prohibitive.

Please refer to Master Response 3, located in Section 6.2 of this document, concerning availability and cost of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment 107-3

Comment Summary: The comment asserts that application of 25 inches of reclaimed water per acre is not feasible in West County.

The comment is not correct regarding assumed crop water use. Crop water consumption is discussed starting on Page 17 of Appendix E-2 (Irrigation Suitability Land Classification - West County Area). For West County a water use of 20 inches per year is assumed, based on local climate data. When considering irrigation inefficiencies (for example loss of water through evaporation during sprinkler irrigation), the total application rate is estimated to be about 24 inches per year. The Draft EIR/EIS recognizes potential problems with growing alfalfa, and does not assume a conversion to "high tech" agricultural. This is simply one possible scenario that was developed in order to allow an evaluation of the potential range of impacts of different types of agriculture. It is most likely that the majority of West County will remain in pasture, with some forage and fodder crops. The Draft EIR/EIS authors have provided the basis for the calculations of water use in Appendix E-2 and believe that the estimates are a reasonable representation of the potential application of reclaimed water.

Response to Comment 107-4

Comment Summary: The comment questions whether runoff can be prevented from entering creeks.

Mitigation Measure 2.2.3: Restrict Surface and Subsurface Irrigation Water Runoff, on pages 2-23 through 2-25 of the Draft EIR/EIS provides a discussion of measures to

control runoff. This measure does not require construction of structures to contain runoff. Individual site Irrigation and Conservation Management Programs may determine that berms are needed in some areas, but use of setbacks and proper irrigation management procedures will be sufficient to control runoff in many locations. The design of the irrigation program is intended to prevent over irrigation, so that drainage and runoff problems will not occur. The City of Santa Rosa will negotiate a contract with each user to determine the necessary site improvements and how costs will be distributed.

Response to Comment 107-5

Comment Summary: The comment states that there are more than six pond turtles (as indicated in the Draft EIR/EIS) present in the Study Area. In addition, the comment asks what would happen to various wildlife species if a dam is built above their habitat.

Page 3.3-6 in Appendix K-1 (Biological Resources, Volume 1) of the Draft EIR/EIS states that no focused wildlife surveys were conducted on the proposed agricultural lands. Wildlife biologists maintained a list of observed species and noted suitable habitat; however, the intent of this survey was not to completely census wildlife populations at each site. Also refer to Response to Comment 78-7.

Habitat impacts associated with storage reservoir construction are discussed on pages 4.8-68 through 4.8-86 and pages 4.9-55 through 4.9-74, of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment 107-6

Comment Summary: The comment questions the validity of irrigation surveys because all land was not surveyed.

Refer to Response to Comment 29-2.

Response to Comment 107-7

Comment Summary: The comment concerns the construction of a large dam in a seismically active region.

The Draft EIR/EIS authors assume that the comments reference to the 1905 earthquake is in error and refers to the 1906 San Francisco earthquake. As indicated in the Draft EIR/EIS on page 4.3-35, damage in Santa Rosa during the 1906 earthquake was substantial. Dams and reservoirs built in California are designed to withstand large earthquakes (Richter magnitude 7.5 to 8). Refer also to Response to Comment 93-6 regarding historic performance of earth filled dams in California during large earthquakes.